Claims 1, 4, 9, and 15 have been amended. Claims 1, 4-22, and 24-38 are now pending in the present application. Applicant hereby requests entry of this Amendment and Response and further examination of the present application in view of above amendments and following remarks.

In the Office Action mailed on July 5, 2002, claims 1, 5-7, 9-13, and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lentz (U.S. Pat. No. 5,886,705) in view of Tanaka, et al. (U.S. Pat. No.5,793,376), claims 3, 4, 8, 14, 20-22, 24-25, and 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lentz in view of Tanaka, et al., and further in view of Chelstowski et al (U.S. Pat. No.5,461,712), and claims 26-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lentz and Tanaka, et al., in view of Chelstowski et al and further in view of Chimoto (U.S. Pat. No.5,550,961). Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection and requests reconsideration thereof in view of the foregoing amendments.

Claim 1

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lentz (U.S. Pat. No. 5,886,705) in view of Tanaka et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,376). Applicant submits that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Lentz in view of Tanaka. Amended Claim 1 includes the element wherein each texture data packet has data relating to the dimensional type of that data packet's associated texture map. This limitation is supported by the specification (page 2, lines 19-20; page 8, lines 16-18; page 11, lines 14-15) and is not disclosed by Lentz or Tanaka, or a combination thereof.

The Office Action stated in page 7 that Chelstowski discloses the limitation of texture data relating to the dimensional type of its texture map, and the Office Action cited the Abstract line 3-5, Col. 1, Lines 45-50, Col. 2, Lines 18-24, Col. 3, Lines 7-9, Col. 5, Lines 55-58, and Col. 14, Lines 19-31 to support that statement.

Upon review of the cited passages in Chelstowski, Applicant disagrees with Examiner's interpretation of the cited passages.

The Chelstowski Abstract at lines 3-5 states that a storage area contains data for two-dimensional images; Col. 1, lines 45-50, states the surface detail is stored in a texture map of two or three dimensional arrays; Col. 2, lines 18-24, states a texture map is defined in a two-dimensional coordinate system and a three-dimensional surface is

defined in a three-dimensional system; Col. 3, lines 7-9, repeats the statement in the Abstract lines 3-5; Col. 5, lines 55-58, states that the two-dimensional description also applies to one-dimensional map or buffer; Col. 4, lines 19-31, introduces Fig. 33 and 34, and states in the preferred embodiment the texture rectangles have dimensions that are powers of two besides supporting one-dimensional texture maps. The cited passages seem to indicate that Chelstowski system supports two-dimensional or three-dimensional texture maps, but they do not suggest embedding the information about the dimension of a texture map in a texture data.

Under MPEP §706.02(j), in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art references when combined "much teach or suggest all the claim limitations." Applicant does not discern where in the cited passages, individually or in combination, the texture data having information regarding a texture packet having data relating to the dimension of its associated texture map. Furthermore, each of the three references (Lentz, Tanaka, and Chlstowski) failed to suggest the combination of its invention with other two references to accomplish the teaching of the present invention. According to Court of Appeals Federal Circuit (CAFC), the examiner must show a motivation to combine the references that create the case of obviousness. *In re Dennis Rouffet*, 149 F. 3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Therefore, Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to clearly explain the cited passages and how they are pertinent to the claimed invention in accord with 37 C.F.R. §1.104 and MPEP §706.02(j), and fails to clearly indicate the motivation for combining three references to accomplish the teaching of the present invention without using the present application as a template for doing so. In view of the suggested combination lacking all claimed elements, and a failure to provide motivation to combine the references, Claim 1, as amended, cannot be rejected as obvious in view thereof and such ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 4-5

Claims 4-5 depend from claim 1, and Applicant asserts that claims 4-5 are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons asserted with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 6-8

Claims 6-8 depend from Claim 1, and Applicant asserts that claims 6-8 are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons asserted with respect to claim 1. Applicant notes that Claim 6 further adds the element of the texture processor including a parsing engine for parsing fetched texture packet and determining information relating to the texture map associated with the fetched texture packet. Claim 7 adds the element of the information in claim 6 relating to the location in the texture buffer of the texture map associated with the fetched texture packet. And Claim 8 adds the element of the information in claim 6 relating to the number of dimensions of the texture map associated with the fetched texture packet. The Office Action again stated that Lentz disclosed the same limitations and cited Col. 1 Line 66-Col. 2 Line 4, Col. 2, Line 5-6, Col. 3, Lines 10-14, Col. 3, Lines 22-36, Col. 5, Lines 22-23, Col. 8, Line 46+, Fig. 1, Fig. 7, Col. 2 Lines 48-60, Col. 4, Lines 14-17, Col. 4, Lines 42-54 and Col. 5, Lines 7-11 to support its statement.

Upon review of the cited passages in Lentz, Applicant does not discern wherein Lentz the specific elements of claims 6-8 are located. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner to clearly explain the cited passages and how they are pertinent to the elements of the claimed invention according to 37 C.F.R. §1.104 and MPEP §706.02(j). As it stands currently, the Office Action failed to "clearly articulate any rejection [...] so that the applicant has the opportunity to provide evidence of patentability" according to MPEP §706. Without explicit direction as to where in Lentz the limitations of claims 6-8 are present, Claims 6-8 cannot be rejected as obvious in view thereof.

Claim 9

The Office Action rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lentz in view of Tanaka et al. Claim 9, as amended, is not anticipated by Lentz in view of Tanaka. Claim 9, as amended, includes the element of parsing the texture packet to determine the number of dimensions of the texture map. The inclusion of this element is supported by the specification (page 2, lines 19-20; page 8, lines 16-18; page 11, lines 14-15) and, as discussed above in regard to Claim 1, is not disclosed by either Lentz or Tanaka, or a combination thereof.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that this rejection has been overcome and requests that Claim 9 be allowed.

Claims 10-13

Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9, and Applicant asserts that claims 10-13 are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons asserted with respect to Claim 9.

Claim 14

The Office Action rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lentz in view of Tanaka et al and further in view of Chelstowski et al. Claim 14 depends from Claim 9, and Applicant asserts that claim 14 is allowable over the cited references for the same reasons asserted with respect to claim 9.

Applicant further notes that Claim 14 adds the element of the texture packet including data relating to the dimensional type of the texture map, the texture map being reconstructed by parsing the texture packet to determine the dimensional type of the texture map, the texture map being reconstructed based upon the determined dimensional type of the texture map. The Office Action stated that Lentz disclosed the same limitations and cited the Abstract, Col. 1, Line 66-Col. 2, Line 4, Col. 2, Line 18-20, Col. 3, Lines 10-14, Col. 3, Lines 22-36, Col. 5, Lines 22-23, and Col. 8, line 46+ to support this statement.

Upon review of the cited passages in Lentz, for the same reason stated above for Claim 1, Applicant does not discern the limitations of claim 14. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner to clearly explain the cite passages and how they are pertinent to the claimed invention according to 37 C.F.R. §1.104 and MPEP §706.02(j). Specifically, Applicant submits that Lentz does not disclose a texture packet being parsed to determine the dimension type of its associated texture map. Without explicit direction as to where in Lentz all elements of Claim 14 is present, Claim 14 cannot be rejected as obvious in view thereof.

Claims 15-19

Independent Claim 15, and dependent Claims 16-19 cannot be rejected as obvious in view of Lentz and Tanaka, et al., for the same reasons stated above for the patentability of Claims 9-13.

Claim 20

Claim 20 cannot be rejected as being unpatentable over Lentz in view of Tanaka, et al., and further in view of Chelstowski, et al., for the same reason stated above for the patentability of Claim 14.

Claim 21

The Office Action rejected Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lentz in view of Tanaka, et al., and further in view of Chelstowski, et al. Applicant asserts that Claim 21 is not anticipated by Lentz in view of Tanaka and Chelstowski for the same reasons stated above for Claim 1.

Again, Applicant submits that no motivation to combine the references has been shown in either Chelstowki or Lentz. The Office Action stated that the motivation for combining the teaching of Chelstowski and Lentz is to provide a faster manipulation of the texture coordinates and to eliminate complicated and expensive circuitry in a graphical accelerator. However, such suggestion uses hindsight based on the present invention to defeat patentability of the same invention. The Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit has said that "when rejection depends on a combination of prior art references, there must be some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references" (emphasis added). *In re Dennis Rouffet*, 149 F. 3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998). This ground of rejection therefore cannot stand due to the lack of motivation to combine the references.

Furthermore, even if there is a direct suggestion for combining Lentz and Chelstowski, their combination does not teach all elements of the rejected claims, and especially the information relating the dimension of type of a texture map to be embedded in the texture packet *itself*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that for the above reasons, Claim 21 is allowable over cited references.

Claims 22 and 24

Claims 22 and 24 depend from claim 21, and Applicant asserts that claims 22 and 24 are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons asserted with respect to Claim 21.

Claim 25

Dependent Claim 25 is patentable for the same reasons stated above regarding Claim 6.

Claim 26

The Office Action rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lentz and Tanaka et al. and further in view of Chelstowski et al and Chimoto (U.S. Pat. No. 5,550,961).

Again, Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to particularly point out the motivation in Lentz, Tanaka, Chelstowki, or Chimoto to combine these *four* teachings. The Office Action stated that the motivation for combining the teachings of Chelstowski and Lentz is to provide a faster manipulation of the texture coordinates and to eliminate complicated and expensive circuitry in a graphical accelerator. The Office Action further stated that the motivation for combining the teachings of Chimoto and Lentz is to operate texturing without extensive using of texture memory. However, the Office Action's approach improperly uses hindsight based on the present invention to defeat patentability of the same invention. Without explicit motivation to combine these four teachings, Claim 26 cannot be rejected as obvious in view thereof.

Claims 27-28

Claims 27-28 depends from Claim 26, and Applicant asserts that Claims 27-28 cannot be rejected for the same reasons asserted with respect to the patentability of Claim 26.

Claims 29-31

Claims 29-31 are patentable for the same reasons stated above regarding Claims 26-28.

Claims 32-34

Claims 32-34 are patentable for the same reasons stated above regarding Claims 26-28.

Claim 35

The Office Action rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lentz in view of Tanaka, et al., and further in view of Chelstowski, et al., and the Office Action cited Lentz's Abstract, Col. 1 Line 66-Col. 2 Line 4, Col. 2, Line 5-6, Col. 3, Lines 10-14, Col. 3, Lines 22-36, Col. 5, Lines 22-23, Col. 8, Line 46+, Fig. 1, Fig. 7, Col. 2 Lines 48-60, Col. 4, Lines 14-17, Col. 4, Lines 42-54, Col. 5, Lines 7-11, and Col. 8, Lines 15-31 to support this statement.

Upon review of the cited passages, as discussed above for Claim 1, Applicant does not discern where in the cited passages, individually or in combination, a data structure with the specific elements is disclosed in Claim 35. Lentz seems to disclose storing data associated with resolution of a texture map, where the resolution indicates the quality of a texture map (col. 2, lines 57-66), in a texture memory.

On the other hand, the dimension field of the present invention indicates whether the texture packet is for a one-dimensional texture map, a two-dimensional map, a three-dimensional map etc. The Office Action must clearly explain the cited passages and how they are pertinent to the claimed invention according to 37 C.F.R. §1.104 and MPEP §706.02(j). As it stands currently, the Office Action failed to "clearly articulate any rejection [...] so that the applicant has the opportunity to provide evidence of patentability" according to MPEP §706. Without explicit direction as to where in Lentz the specific elements of Claim 35, as amended, are present, Claim 35 cannot be rejected as obvious in view thereof.

Claims 36-38

Claims 36-38 depend from claim 35, and Applicant asserts that claims 36-38 are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons asserted above with respect to Claim 35.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 4-22, and 24-38 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (770-291-2125) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

No additional fees are believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including any necessary extensions of time, which are hereby requested, to Deposit Account No. 501403.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwards.
By his Representatives,

BOCKHOP & REICH, LLP.

3235 Satellite Blvd,
Building 400, Suite 300
Duluth, GA 30093

Date 7/26/02

Li K. Wang
Reg. No. 44,393

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 26 day of 7, 2002.

Li K. Wang
Name

Signature